IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

V.

ORDER RE DEFENDANT FLORES'

EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR

DISCLOSURE OF FURTHER

INFORMATION FROM SFPD

MARQUEZ HOMICIDE FILE

On May 17, the Court turned over to counsel for defendant Moris Flores all records received from the SFPD in response his subpoena for materials related to the homicide of Brian Marquez. The Court, however, redacted all identifying information of witnesses and personal information implicating privacy concerns (dates of birth, addresses, phone numbers) prior to producing the records and specified that any request for production of unredacted material must specify what material is sought to be unredacted and articulate good cause.

Defendant Flores now moves for: (1) witness identifying information redactions to be removed; and (2) the production of additional material. The SFPD shall have until **FRIDAY**, **JUNE 3 AT 5 P.M.** to respond to defendant Flores' motion. If no response is received from the SFPD, records with witness identifying information will be turned over to counsel for defendant Flores, subject to protective order. If the SFPD opposes the motion, defendant Flores will have until **TUESDAY**, **JUNE 7 AT 5 P.M.** to file a response. Oral argument on the motion will be heard on **WEDNESDAY**, **JUNE 8 AT 1 P.M.**

Defendant Flores' motion and the supporting declarations shall be filed ex parte and under seal as the documents contain protected material and material produced ex parte to counsel. There is no need, however, for this order to be filed under seal or ex parte, as it does not reference any substantive material not already in the public record. Nor do the national or local rules or the Sixth Amendment prohibit the SFPD from sharing the motion with the government, especially given that it is a follow-on motion to a publicly filed motion (Dkt. No. 4122).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 31, 2011.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE